

APPENDIX 1

Public and Peer Review Panel Comments

Appendix 1-3
Authors Responses to Comments

Appendix 1-3j
Author's Response to Comments on Chapter 10

Chapter 10: Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan

Agnes R. McLean

Responses to Public and Peer Review panel comments

- **Peer review panel comments and author's responses**

Comment: It is very important that the public clearly understand that the Restudy Bill authorized the District to construct pilot projects to help determine the feasibility of technologies included in the comprehensive plan. Testing these technologies does not imply that they are proven. A technology may be locally feasible, but not viable within a different context or larger region. Some effort should be made to explain this context. (p. 10-1)

Response: A footnote to this effect was added to the text.

Comment: The very important concept of a program cannot be overemphasized as a means to avoid misunderstandings as to both process and sequencing of investments as well as anticipated results. It must be clearly understood that a master program management plan does not imply finality, but rather provides a framework for adjusting investments to new scientific data and the results of the pilot projects. (pp. 10-3, 10-4)

Response: The text was strengthened on the discussion of the Master Plan (p. 10-5).

Comment: Isn't it logical that the management plan also includes a brief statement as to expected outcomes/results? (p. 10-5)

Response: Management plans provide the tasks, schedules, and costs for a particular activity. The results or outcomes of performing the tasks will be documented in the work products identified for that activity (e.g., a project implementation report).

Comment: Figure 10-2 presents a logical framework for restoration activities. What is not stated is how the teams will interact. (p. 10-6)

Response: A flow diagram and accompanying text has been added to Appendix 10, with a reference added in this section.

Comment: The public should be involved from the outset in planning efforts. It is not clear if this is the case. (p. 10-7)

Response: A clarifying sentence was added to the text.

Comment: Wouldn't it also be logical to include 'results from pilot projects' which may permit adjustments to other investments being planned? (p. 10-9)

Response: Results from pilot projects are mentioned in the paragraph.

Comment: A clear statement should be made as to how the CERP should be adapted as new information is forthcoming in the implementation process.

Response: Note this paragraph on p. 10-5: *"The Comprehensive Plan was developed to accomplish a set of system-wide goals and objectives. Due to the size and complexity of the Comprehensive Plan, it was divided into smaller implementable packages that are referred to as projects. As these projects are further planned and designed, analyses and evaluations that measure each package's overall contribution to system-wide goals will be conducted in order to determine and thus ensure, that the system-wide goals and benefits of the Comprehensive Plan are being realized. This process will allow the Comprehensive Plan to be refined and revised, as necessary, as part of an adaptive assessment process."*

Comment: A clear statement must be made as to the water quality monitoring process that will be employed as implementation proceeds.

Response: Text was added to this effect on p. 10-6. The monitoring plan for the Comprehensive Plan is currently in development, and will include water quality parameters.

Comment: The report should attempt to define 'restoration' or 'recovery' that relates specific management goals or legislative mandates of P or Hg levels to the more general goals of the CERP and the long-term health of the Everglades system.

Response: The "future without project" condition for the feasibility report included full implementation of the Everglades Construction Project. Included in both the *Interim Report* (1999) and the *2000 Everglades Consolidated Report* for Chapter 10 is a section on the linkages between the comprehensive plan and the Everglades Construction Project. To quote the consolidated report: "The Restudy [comprehensive plan] will identify any modifications of the existing ECP design/operations necessary to ensure that performance will not be adversely affected by subsequent implementation of Restudy components" (p. 10-16). Additionally, a restoration "success" white paper was developed during the study phase. It will be the role of RECOVER to revise this vision of success as more information becomes available through the science-based process and adaptive assessment strategy being used to assess performance of the comprehensive plan.

Comment: It seems logical that as investments are initiated, a summary be included at the outset of this chapter. This should also include some statement as the projects relate to issues such as management of TP, site specific P, Hg, etc.

Response: This comment will be taken into consideration in subsequent reports.

- **Everglades Program Team (USDOl) comments and author's responses**

Comment: There is a need for a process to insure that the future restoration objectives of the CERP are incorporated into work on non-CERP projects. I would encourage the development of a CERP/non-CERP coordination process as a priority future task.

Response: The process by which non-CERP projects will be evaluated and coordinated with over-all restoration goals is inherent in RECOVER activities.

- **John Arthur Marshall, Arthur R. Marshall Foundation, comments and author's responses**

Comment: Restoration of Florida's ancient forests has yet to be rigorously considered in the CERP.

Response: The authorizing language contained in the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 allowed the Corps to review the C&SF Project "...with a view to determining whether modifications *to the existing project* are advisable..." (author's emphasis added).

Comment: Flow-function and its role in dynamic storage was never modeled.

Response: The author refers the commenter to Appendix B, Hydrology and Hydraulics Modeling, of the feasibility report.